5th September 1928]

(b) whether these channels come under the Ganjam Minor Rivers system;

(c) if so, the total expenditure incurred up to date on the Ganjam Minor Rivers system;

(d) what the revenue derived by Government from this system is and what percentage of return it works out on the total capital outlay on the Minor Rivers system;

(e) whether there is an estimate of cost made for improvement of irrigation under the Dusi Urlam channels taken from the Nagavalli river by the construction of a surplus weir across the river; and

(f) when it is proposed to be taken up?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Rupees 2,83,976 to end of 1926-27.

(d)

Gross receipts (1926-27)	Rs. 65,113
Working expenses	„ 49,655
Net revenue	„ 15,458
Return	Per cent 5·44

(e) There was a proposal to construct an anicut across the Langulya at the head of the Dusi channel. This was dropped in 1925 mainly on financial grounds.

(f) There is no present intention of reviving the scheme unless fresh facts are brought forward by the Committee constituted in 1927 of which the hon. Member is a member. The report of that Committee is awaited.

Supply of water to lands under the Urlam and Dusi channels.

* 124 Q.—Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that the head-works at the mouth of the Urlam and Dusi channels are now unfit to carry sufficient water in those channels to irrigate lands under them; and

(b) whether the Government will have the matter investigated and construct irrigation works to ensure proper supply from the river when water is low in it?

A.—(a) There have been complaints to this effect.

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 123.

Recommendations of the Mettur Committee.

* 125 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased (i) to place before the Council (a) the Government Order passed on my token motion carried by the Council on 17th March 1928 for the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 235·17 lakhs for Irrigation, etc., by Rs. 100 in order to criticise the extravagance in the expenditure and the partiality shown to British machinery and plant at heavy loss to the Indian tax-payer, and to press for the election of a Council Committee to enquire into and report on the alleged extravagances and irregularities and waste and make suggestions

[5th September 1928

for modifying the scheme and carrying out the scheme in the most economical way and to the best advantage of the public and (*b*) the report and the recommendations of the Committee appointed by that Government Order and (ii) to state—

(*a*) what action Government have taken or contemplate taking in connexion with the revised estimates in view of the Committee's recommendations;

(*b*) whether the revised estimates have been forwarded for sanction of the Secretary of State;

(*c*) if so, whether they have been forwarded along with the Mettur Committee's report and recommendations; and

(*d*) if not, for what reasons?

A.—(i) (*a*) A copy of G.O. No. 1324 (6–S.)-I., dated 14th May 1928,[a] is laid on the table.

(*b*) The Government are considering the report and the recommendations of Members of the Legislative Council who visited Mettur with reference to G.O. No. 1324 (6–S.)-I., dated 14th May 1928, and will decide the question of publishing them when the Government Order on the subject is ready.

(ii) (*a*) That is one of the points the Government have still to consider.

(*b*) The Revised Estimates for the Project were submitted to the Government of India in July last and this Government have no information whether they have been forwarded to the Secretary of State.

(*c*) The report of the Mettur deputation is still under the consideration of the Government, but a copy of it has been sent to the Government of India.

(*d*) The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to the answer to clause (ii) (*a*) above.

Mr. J. A. Saldanha:—"With reference to ii (*b*), am I to understand that the works on the revised estimate are being carried on without the sanction of the Secretary of State?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"The works are being carried on with the authority of the Secretary of State who has authorized that course in anticipation of his examination and approval of the revised estimates."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know if the revised estimate after approval by the Secretary of State would come before this House for at least money sanction?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"As far as I can recollect, all the features of the expenditure were laid before the House at the last budget meeting."

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar:—"I am referring to the deviation as provided in the revised estimate; I wish to know if the excess expenditure will come before this House for sanction?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"That will be considered."

---

a Separately laid on the table.

5th September 1928]

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" May I know whether the Secretary of State has really approved of the estimate? It is stated here that this Government have no information whether it has been forwarded to the Secretary of State. How can the hon. Member say that the Secretary of State has sanctioned it?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I did not say the Secretary of State had sanctioned the revised estimate; I said that the work is proceeding with his permission in anticipation of the examination and sanction of the revised estimate."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" What sort of communication was made on the subject? Was it by letter or telegram?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I can't be certain whether it was by letter or telegram, but certainly it must have been in one or the other form."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" May I know the approximate date?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I must ask for notice."

Mr. C V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" May I know whether the report of the Mettur deputation was sent with the letter submitting the revised estimate or afterwards?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I am not quite sure."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" May I know if, on the date on which the revised estimate was submitted by this Government to the Government of India, the report of the Mettur deputation had been received?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I think it had been."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Then, may I know whether in that letter this Government had stated anything about the Mettur deputation or its report?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" No, Sir, we had not finished considering it."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" But it is stated that a copy of it has been sent to the Government of India. The report has been made before the submission of the estimate to the Government of India. I am simply asking why no mention was made of the report in that submission to the Government of India?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Because we had not considered it What we stated to the Government of India was that, after the Government considered the report, their remarks thereon would be submitted."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Even before a decision has been arrived at, a copy of the report was sent to the Government of India. I ask why in the first submission no reference was made to the report?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Government could make their recommendations only after fully considering the report."

[5th September 1928

Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar :—"Is it any use coming to the House for sanction of any deviation after the Government take the Secretary of State's sanction for the deviation ?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—"That is possible."

Recommendations of the Mettur deputation.

*126 *Q.*—Mr. S Satyamurti : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have considered the report of the Mettur deputation ;

(*b*) what recommendations of the deputation the Government have accepted or propose to accept ; and

(*c*) the reasons for rejecting the recommendations, if any, of the deputation ?

A.—The report is at present under the consideration of the Government.

Land Revenue

Yield of staple food crops in Ganjam, Kistna and other districts.

*127 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state in terms of annas the yield of the staple food crops which represent—

(*a*) the bumper ;

(*b*) the normal ;

(*c*) the fair ; and

(*d*) the poor outturn for the districts of Ganjam, Kistna, Kurnool, Bellary, Tanjore, Malabar and South Kanara, respectively ?

A.—The yield in terms of annas is given below :—

bumper	...	...	13—16 annas.
normal	...	...	12 ,,
fair	...	...	8—11 ,,
poor	...	...	4—7 ,,
bad	...	...	0—3 ,,

This notation is common to all the districts. There is no separate notation for the districts mentioned by the hon. Member.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—Is the hon. the Revenue Member aware that the impression in the minds of many village officers is that the normal crop is 13—16 annas, while it is the bumper that is 13—16 annas."

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—"I do not admit the inference the hon. Member draws."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : —"May I know what steps the Government have taken to periodically acquaint the village officers about these classifications of crops ?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—"The hon. Member is probably aware that every year instructions relating to them are impressed upon the village officers at jamabandi."